

Serial No.: 10/017,242
Attorney Docket No.: F-419

Patent

REMARKS

1. Status of Claims

Claims 1, 3-9 and 12-25 were pending in the Application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 7 and 25 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully request entry of the above amendments and consideration of the enclosed remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-9 and 12-25 will remain pending in the application.

2. Claim Rejections

Starting on page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 7, 9, 12-13 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,557,045 B1 to Tsukui, et al. ("Tsukui '045") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,752,059 to Holleran, et al. ("Holleran '059").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to recite "determining the e-mail address formatting rule from a group of formatting rules for the unique identifier portion of the e-mail address based on the gathered e-mail address data" and the rejection is moot.

With regard to the Tsukui '045 reference, the reference describes methods focusing on quick entry of known elements for speedy data entry, not for determining previously unknown e-mail addresses.

Importantly, the methods described in Tsukui '045 fail and terminate for unknown user names of a particular e-mail domain. The teachings of Holleran '059 do not overcome this defect in the prior art. Holleran '059 does not teach or suggest determining formatting rules from a group of formatting rules. Instead, it teaches a static format of name. In such a system, there would be no motivation or suggestion whatsoever to determine what formatting rule was being used – there was only one static format to use.

Serial No.: 10/017,242
Attorney Docket No.: F-419

Patent

Dependent claims 7, 9 and 12-13 are patentable over the cited reference for at least the same reasons.

Furthermore, with regard to claim 7, which recites "determining whether the identifier portion is consistent with one or more known e-mail address formatting rules rules from a group of at least two known e-mail address formatting rules", the Tsukui '045 reference does not describe performing any format determination on the identifier portion of the e-mail address. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Holleran '059 does not perform any format determination because there is only one static format used.

Furthermore, with regard to claim 12 that recites:

"comparing a first sub-portion of the identifier portion to the list of known first names; and
comparing a second sub-portion of the identifier portion to the list of known last names"

the Tsukui '045 reference does not contemplate sub-portions of the identifier portion of the e-mail address. Importantly, Holleran '059 does not contemplate sub-portions of the identifier portion of the e-mail address. Neither of the cited references contemplates sub-portions of the identifier portion of the e-mail address.

Regarding claim 19 that recites:

The method of claim 7 wherein the one or more known e-mail address formatting rules are from a list consisting of: last.first, first.last, alphanumeric only, LLLLLLFF, FFLLLLLL, FMLLLLLL, telephone number, punctuation required, minimum number of characters, or maximum number of characters," it is clear that Holleran '059 does not contemplate multiple identifier portion formatting rules.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that currently pending claims 1, 7, 9, 12-13 and 19 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Serial No.: 10/017,242
Attorney Docket No.: F-419

Patent

Starting on page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,557,045 B1 to Tsukui, et al. ("Tsukui '045") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,298,341 to Mann, et al. ("Mann '341").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 25 and the rejection is moot.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the references are not properly combined, as they are not in analogous art. Furthermore, the references do not teach or suggest formatting rules for the identifier portion.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 25 is in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Starting on page 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,557,045 B1 to Tsukui, et al. ("Tsukui '045") and U.S. Patent No. 5,752,059 to Holleran, et al. ("Holleran '059") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,654,779 B1 to Tsuei ("Tsuei '779").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the claim is patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references are not properly combined.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 3 is in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Starting on page 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4-6, 8 and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,557,045 B1 to Tsukui, et al. ("Tsukui '045") and U.S. Patent No. 5,752,059 to

Serial No.: 10/017,242
Attorney Docket No.: F-419

Patent

Holleran, et al. ("Holleran '059") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,829,607 B1 to Tafoya, et al. ("Tafoya '607").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claims 1 and 7.

With regard to claim 8, the cited references do not teach or suggest at least the following element:

"determining whether the plurality of identifier portions are consistent with known e-mail address formatting rules."

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4-6, 8 and 20-22 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Starting on page 17 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,557,045 B1 to Tsukui, et al. ("Tsukui '045") and U.S. Patent No. 5,752,059 to Holleran, et al. ("Holleran '059") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,329,405 to Hou, et al. ("Hou '405").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claims 1 and 7.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references are not properly combined.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 14 and 16 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Serial No.: 10/017,242
Attorney Docket No.: F-419

Patent

Starting on page 20 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 15 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,557,045 B1 to Tsukui, et al. ("Tsukui '045") and U.S. Patent No. 5,752,059 to Holleran, et al. ("Holleran '059") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,329,405 to Hou, et al. ("Hou '405") and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,829,607 B1 to Tafoya, et al. ("Tafoya '607").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claims 1 and 7.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references are not properly combined.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 15 and 17-18 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the invention as presently claimed in claims 1, 3-9 and 12-25 is in condition for allowance.

3. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance of claims 23-24 on page 23 of the Office Action.

4. Conclusion Of Remarks

For at least the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance and early and favorable action thereon is requested.

If the Examiner believes that additional issues may be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney for Applicants at (203) 924-3180.

Serial No.: 10/017,242
Attorney Docket No.: F-419


Patent

5. Authorization

No fee is believed due with this Amendment. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for the response or credit any overpayment to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit Account Number 16-1885, Order No. F-419.

In the event that an extension of time or additional extension of time is required to make this response timely filed, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit Account Number 16-1885, Order No. F-419.

Respectfully submitted,



George M. Macdonald
Reg. No. 39,284
Attorney for Applicants
Telephone (203) 924-3180
PITNEY BOWES INC.
Intellectual Property and Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive, P.O. Box 3000
Shelton, CT 06484-8000